

COMMITTEE ON BILLS ON SECOND READING

May 14, 2002

5:30 PM

Chairman Wihby called the meeting to order.

The Clerk called the roll.

Present: Aldermen Wihby, Sysyn, DeVries, Smith, Forest
Aldermen Gatsas, Guinta and O'Neil were also present.

Messrs: S. Lewry, R. MacKenzie, F. Rusczek, Chief Driscoll, L. LaFreniere,
R. Comstock

Chairman Wihby addressed item 3 of the agenda:

Ordinance Amendments:

“Amending Chapter 130: General Offenses of the Code of Ordinances of the City of Manchester by repealing Section 130.10 Tattooing in its entirety.”

“Amending the Zoning Ordinance of the City of Manchester to include a new use group category for Tattoo Parlors, inserting changes to Table 5.10, adding supplementary regulations for tattoo parlors, and providing for location restrictions so as to prohibit such parlors within 600 feet from each other and not less than 500 feet from a Residential or Civic Zone.”

Chairman Wihby stated the ordinance came from Administration and passed. I think we have gotten some letters since then. David Goldstein came today and we had one from Stephanie Lewry from Intown on May 8th and April 30th. Chairman Wihby asked Mrs. Lewry to come forward asking were you present when the Committee on Administration took it up?

Mrs. Lewry replied no I was not. I did receive a transcript of that meeting.

Chairman Wihby asked did they have the airport from...you're writing a letter basically from businesses?

Mrs. Lewry replied no.

Chairman Wihby stated we appreciate the Committee on Administration and I would ask input from Intown Manchester.

Mrs. Lewry replied after the first meeting according to the transcript, there was some question about before moving ahead it might be a good idea to get some input from Intown Manchester.

Chairman Wihby asked did they ask you for input at their committee? They told you to come here and give us input?

Deputy Clerk Normand replied that is correct at that meeting they recommended that it be passed on with the stipulation that Intown submit a letter in the meantime so that it could get to this committee.

Chairman Wihby asked when they took it up, they didn't take up any information from Intown?

Deputy Clerk Normand replied that is correct.

Chairman Wihby asked could you tell us what the bulk of your letter is and what you're thinking should happen or not happen?

Mrs. Lewry replied the Intown Manchester Executive Committee met quickly so that we could respond by the date that was stipulated in the letter. At first the Executive Committee didn't know very much about any pending tattoo parlor or any request for information from Intown about it. We had to review the transcript of the Administration Committee meeting to understand what the scope of the situation was. After we understood that the recommendation was to have tattoo parlors open in the CBSD only, and that they would be 600 feet apart from each other and within a 500 foot buffer zone of residential and civic zones we went to the Planning Department for a map of that particular area and we mapped out what looked like would be possible places for tattoo parlors if they were going to be allowed in the downtown district. It appeared from the map that the only places that tattoo parlors could be positioned within the Central Business Service District is on Elm Street. In fact most of them would be on the East Side of Elm Street only because of the 500 foot buffer zone. Only being on Elm Street seemed to be counter to the mission of Intown Manchester, which is to bring businesses back into the downtown and to help to revitalize the business district. Our feeling was

that if Elm Street is peppered with tattoo parlors it would make it more difficult for us to accomplish our mission. Therefore, the Executive Committee replied as long as those tattoo parlors are restricted to virtually Elm Street we would find that it would be difficult for us to accomplish our mission and would not recommend that tattoo parlors be allowed in the Central Business Service District with those restrictions. Thank you.

Chairman Wihby replied thank you and would Mr. MacKenzie please come up.

Chairman Wihby asked is Mrs. Lewry reading that right that it will only be on Elm Street?

Mr. MacKenzie replied at some point you may ask Leon to come up.

Chairman Wihby asked when it went to Administration was there a recommendation from Building or Planning?

Mr. MacKenzie replied no there was none, I don't believe there was any.

Chairman Wihby asked they didn't ask you for any or you didn't have any?

Mr. MacKenzie replied that they directed the staff, as I understand it to prepare an ordinance. I was not at that particular meeting, but they asked that the staff look at preparing an ordinance for tattoo parlors. I know Mr. LaFreniere worked on it quite a bit, we had a couple of meetings. I think our primary issue was not whether or not tattoo parlors should be allowed but if they are allowed we didn't feel it appropriate to have a large concentration of them, or to be near residential areas. There is a basis in other zoning to have separation between the tattoo parlor so there wouldn't be a concentration and we did after looking at other parts of the ordinance recommend 600 feet from each other and certain distance from residential areas.

Chairman Wihby asked is Mrs. Lewry right that, they will end up on Elm Street?

Mr. MacKenzie replied there would be some locations on side streets where CBSD is a little wider. There would be some locations on Elm Street. Although with a quick glance at the map I would only see maybe a potential for five to six locations at a maximum. They could be on Elm Street in certain locations.

Chairman Wihby asked did the committee asked you to draw up something where we could allow tattoos in the City and they left it up to your discretion to write it up and that is what passed. Whose recommendation was it to do it this way?

Mr. MacKenzie replied yes and I would ask Mr. LaFreniere to comment on that as well. The City Clerk's Office did coordinate these meetings, so we met with the City Clerk and tried to prepare an ordinance.

Chairman Wihby asked did you realize that they could be on Elm Street?

Mr. MacKenzie replied it was understood in order to stay away from residential areas and the distancing requirements that it would be possible there on Elm Street, yes.

Chairman Wihby asked does anyone else want to speak against or for? How about the Police?

Mr. MacKenzie replied I know the Police Chief is here, but I would not want to speak for him. Fred Ruscsek is also here and in the past they have raised

Chairman Wihby asked is there a way to do this so it doesn't come on Elm Street?

Mr. MacKenzie replied you could eliminate the distance from residential areas and then specifically legislate that they not be on Elm Street or within 100 ft of Elm Street. You could do it that way.

Chairman Wihby asked that pretty much takes care of not having any, or are there still areas where there would be so?

Mr. MacKenzie replied there would be side streets where you could do it like Hanover Street, Manchester Street, Lake Avenue, and West Merrimack Street. There would be certain locations if you said not on Elm Street.

Chairman Wihby asked does anyone have any questions for Mr. MacKenzie or Mr. LaFreniere before we have the Police Chief up?

Alderman Sysyn stated according to the usage, it says it is a permitted use in the Central Business District on that table of uses.

Chairman Wihby replied what they are saying is exactly what Mrs. Lewry said, that they could be in the Central Business District basically on Elm Street and a few side streets the way it is written up now.

Alderman Sysyn asked so they could have a couple on Elm Street?

Chairman Wihby replied they could have five or six locations is what Mr. MacKenzie is saying.

Alderman DeVries asked could you repeat again the other locations where you thought this use might be allowable if it was changed from the just the Central Business District?

Mr. MacKenzie replied you could put it in B2 general business areas which would be places like Daniel Webster Highway North, South Willow Street, Second Street, East Side Plaza, North Side Plaza. I think the staff had some reservations about that. If you look at the Salem commercial strip there is a tendency to.....if you put it in an auto orientated area there is a tendency to have much larger signs, more directional signs, flashing signs. If you have it in a more pedestrian area such as the downtown you don't tend to get as much of the signage and brightly colored ways to attract people. I think our general impression was that it was not necessarily the best location on Second Street, Hooksett Road or South Willow Street.

Chairman Wihby asked Alderman DeVries was that your question. I thought you meant excluding Elm Street?

Alderman DeVries replied he did answer that with the other B2 districts.

Chairman Wihby asked Mr. MacKenzie can you explain that to me. I thought you said like Hanover Street, Merrimack Street. Now you are telling me it can be in the other areas the way this is written up?

Mr. MacKenzie replied I believe that Alderman DeVries asked if you did it other than the Central Business District what would that look like and what areas would be effected. There are a number of areas...major arterials around the City which they could theoretically go in.

Chairman Wihby asked if you left it like it was but excluded Elm Street what would it look like?

Mr. MacKenzie replied there would probably be relatively limited situations that you could put them in. Again there would be the side streets, Amherst, Lowell, Hanover, Merrimack, Manchester, and Lake.

Chairman Wihby asked Alderman DeVries do you have a follow up question?

Alderman DeVries replied no, but I would like to hear from the committee.

Chairman Wihby asked are you two guys on that committee?

Alderman Guinta stated I would defer to the Chairman of that Committee first.

Alderman Gatsas stated with the understanding that when somebody says it is going to pepper Elm Street, I think the committee looked at it and the 600 feet distance from one location to the next certainly would take you an awful long ways away. Let's assume Elm Street and Amherst Street. Where would 600 feet take you in that location heading North or South?

Mr. LaFreniere replied we did run into this question and I do remember you asking this Alderman Gatsas at the committee meeting. I think we had tried to approximate the size of a City block and make an estimate as to how far apart they could be. The block links that we have for example between Hanover and Amherst would be in the order of 300 ft or so it would be an approximate of two-block type of radius.

Alderman Gatsas asked once you hit Manchester Street, you hit the residential zone so you probably couldn't go there?

Mr. LaFreniere stated that may be the case in the Southerly directly on the East Side. On the West Side we do have some additional depth in the CBSD district with the Depot Street being in the CBSD zone. I am not so sure that you couldn't access a sight.in that area also to the South.

Alderman Gatsas stated when you folks reviewed the ordinance it was on the Administration agenda for some two months. We looked at every ordinance for most New Hampshire towns and some Massachusetts ones. We had the Planning Department and the Clerk's Office and the City Solicitor's Office sit down and draw up an ordinance that had some type of parameters. They are the ones that brought it forward to the committee. I think that by the time you are done looking at those parameters it isn't like you could have 10 or 15 locations on Elm Street. What we were told is that you may be looking at two or three.

Mr. LaFreniere replied while it would not be my intent to liken the nature of the tattoo parlor to a sexually orientated business, we did draw from the sexually orientated business which is another type of use that there has been concern expressed about in the past...about the potential for proliferation of. This language that we included with the tattoo parlor proposed ordinance was drawn directly from the current parameters set forth for the sexually orientated business section in an effort to try to maintain some sort of standard in the ordinance for how to deal these types of uses that warrant additional oversight and restriction.

Chairman Wihby asked so these areas where you are saying the tattoo shops can go on Elm Street, the sexual orientated business would be able to go there too if they had wanted to.

Mr. LaFreniere replied that is correct. Essentially it would be in the same locations because the parameters are almost identical.

Alderman Guinta asked could you explain to me more in depth...you touched on it before but my understanding is that if tattoo parlors are going to go into the City we would like to have them far enough apart from each other for what particular reason?

Mr. LaFreniere replied the concern is if the circumstances existed where these types of uses were not restricted we could have a potential of having a concentration of these uses in a single block area or two-block area. Part of the concern was to not focus the intensity of the impact of the use in a single area by requiring them to be spread apart.

Alderman Guinta asked so there is a general agreement that if this is allowed this is not a use that you would like to be in a concentrated area?..... If we don't want it in a concentrated area than why would we want it? Is there a reason why we want tattoo parlors in the City?

Mr. LaFreniere replied again as Mr. MacKenzie pointed out we as a staff were trying to follow the direction that we were provided from the Committee on Administration. It was our understanding that this was a use that is currently restricted in a manner that was not in keeping with what the Committee thought was appropriate. We developed this particular set of criteria in an effort to address that perhaps as a first opportunity to take a look at these types of uses and see how or what types of experiences we might have with them. Currently we do not have any experience within the community to draw from.

Alderman Guinta asked so you did not look at this from a policy standpoint, you strictly did this by request and by request only, not policy, just.....

Mr. LaFreniere replied in our communications with the Committee we did try to point out, did feel strongly all the members of this Sub-Committee if you will...the staff members that took a look at this felt it was important to point out that this does represent a policy issue that the Board of Mayor and Aldermen should make. It was not something that the staff was comfortable coming forward with a recommendation on.

Chairman Wihby stated I would like to hear from Mr. Rusczek and then the Chief. Are there enough chairs up there for all four of you?

Mr. Rusczek asked do you have a question?

Chairman Wihby replied you have something in here with some concerns with the state law or something?

Mr. Rusczek replied when we were...the history is the place to start. For many years long before I came to work for the City we had an ordinance on the books that said only a licensed physician can apply tattoos. Through the beginning of the HIV epidemic and concerns around hepatitis B, I always felt some comfort in that and that it provided some protection here in Manchester from concerns around blood born pathogens. When this came before the Committee on Administration I was asked to look at the current statistics, health statistics in the country to determine if that concern was still valid. We did some research and looked at the US Center for Disease Control information as well as other information and regulations that are out in the country. We concluded that there is not enough information to show that tattoo parlors are a concern for blood born pathogens when properly regulated. We looked at the state regulations and felt comfortable that rather than the Manchester Health Department trying to duplicate the state regulations that the state regulations would be enforced by the Department of Health and Human Services here in Manchester, as they would anywhere else should the City decide to begin to allow tattoo parlors by folks other than licensed physicians.

Chief Driscoll asked Mr. Rusczek do you want the state to inspect and regulate everything and the Board of Health in Manchester would not be policing this effort?

Mr. Rusczek replied as we have in the past we try very hard not to duplicate a service that is being provided by somebody else. If the state has the licensing set up and the permit fees it wouldn't make any sense for us to try to duplicate. We have other things that we would be better off spending our staff time on.

Chairman Wihby asked so you would like to see something in here that says that?

Mr. Rusczek replied if the City allows them, they automatically by default will be licensed and regulated by the state.

Chairman Wihby asked Mr. Rusczek are you for or against this or do you not have an opinion?

Mr. Rusczek replied I do not have an opinion one way or another.

Chairman Wihby called upon Chief Driscoll to come forward.

Chief Driscoll replied good evening Mr. Chairman.

Chairman Wihby stated I saw something in writing that said someone went to their committee and said that they didn't have a problem but that person couldn't speak for someone else so now you are here. Is that what I saw or read in the newspaper or something?

Chief Driscoll replied I do not know what you saw.

Chairman Wihby asked did anyone see that? Did you guys go to the committee and speak in favor of the tattoos and not have a problem?

Chief Driscoll replied no we did not. I believe I was at that committee meeting, but didn't speak. I was under the impression that the City would not act favorably upon that. I was quite surprised when the Committee did and I saw it on the Bills on Second Reading agenda. I felt it necessary to come here and appear tonight. I am opposed to it and I am opposed for reasons that probably are uncharacteristic of the Police Department. I can't tell you that it is going to increase crime, I can't tell you that it will bring people to the community that are not in the best interest of the community. I can't tell you any of those things that I would typically rely on. However I can tell you that we worked real hard and I don't say we the Police Department I say we the community - my people in community policing, the people in planning, the people...all of the different agencies, social service agencies to turn this community around. I for one think it would be a negative thing to bring a tattoo parlor in and put it downtown or on South Willow Street, or Second Street. I do not think that it is in the best interest of the community. I can't say that it will have a negative impact, but I really do not believe it will have a positive impact and I don't know why after all this City has done to bring the City forward. I hear talk about a gas light district downtown and all of the wonderful improvements that have occurred. I do not know what we will accomplish by doing this and I think we have a terrific history in this community of saying no to that type of business and I think we should continue to say no.

Chairman Wihby stated I guess my concern is allowing it on Elm Street. After all, we spent a lot of money and used a lot of Federal funds to take care of Elm Street. Does the Chamber want to weigh in on this or are you just here to listen or can we just say you are for or against?

Ms. Comstock stated I do not have an answer for you yet. I do not have a yes or no. I would tell you that our Executive Committee spent great lengths at their last meeting talking about the tattoo parlor. There are many concerns, very consistent with Chief Driscoll's concerns. The position is considered important enough that we are polling our entire Board of Directors to explore the possibility of ratifying the Executive Committee's indicator and suggestion of opposing the tattoo parlor. The Board of Directors has not been polled. We are in the process of electronically communicating with them now. We will discuss it at our upcoming board meeting. Again the primary issues of concern revolves around Chief Driscoll's. The character of the downtown community, the extent of work and investment that has gone in to develop a community of character and charm that will draw individuals and businesses from outside of the community to the community. There is a high level of concern of the impact with the nature of this kind of business and the cultural, social and economic dynamic of the downtown at large, primarily the Central Business District.

Chairman Wihby asked did you let these thoughts be known to the Committee on Administration?

Ms. Comstock replied not yet because we have not yet taken a formal position. I am in the process of polling the Board of Directors as we speak. When we do have an opinion from the Board of Directors we are very anxious to share it with the City Committee, you, Mr. Chairman, and the other members of the Board of Aldermen, but at this point we do not have a position to express. We are in the process of calling the wishes of the Board of Directors if you will. I can fairly say to you that there is a high level of concern very consistent with Chief Driscoll and Intowns as well.

Chairman Wihby asked Alderman DeVries do you have a question?

Alderman DeVries stated it would appear to me especially if....not that we are trying to draw a conclusion but the sexually orientated businesses have been an allowed business and could have been on Elm Street. It would appear that maybe economics, the cost of rent on Elm Street is holding back that use. Would you agree or disagree with that fact?

Ms. Comstock replied I think you are thinking about market place and fair market value. Your question is directed towards that subject if I am hearing you correctly?

Alderman DeVries stated my thought process tells me that the concerns would be somewhat self limiting and that as the downtown, specifically Elm Street businesses, the rent in turn are increasing on Elm Street. Would that not be a

business of that type could afford for their place of business. I am wondering since we've had a business that is sexually orientated that has been limited to a back alley way where rents are less expensive if that isn't possibly evidence of the fact that the rents on Elm Street normally would be self prohibiting of this type of concern with many of tattoo parlors taking over Elm Street. Do you have thoughts on this?

Ms. Comstock replied it is hard to speculate. Tattoos can be very expensive. It is a fine art. I do not know if I could sit here tonight and tell you that I have done any research in this area. I can tell you that it is my understanding that these kinds of businesses or this particular kind of business can be enormously profitable. I just had a note passed to me by my Director of Government Affairs stating that they get about \$100 an hour. I don't know how to answer that question to be honest with you Alderman. In all fairness I have not explored it either. I think where our Executive Committee at this point is expressing their concern is primarily around the culture and character of a community that they seek to develop. The prerogative of a community and its leadership to make very important decisions about what kind of community they are building and creating for the future, and who feels comfortable and welcome there to conduct business or live a social life. At this point again not coming to you with any kind of position from the Chamber just informal discussion as informal as it can be with a microphone and tape recording, to share with you that there are these concerns surfacing at the Chamber that primarily were expressed around the elements of character and quality of life, quality of economy for future development and growth of a downtown community that is somewhat fragile although in a very positive place right now if that helps to answer the question at all.

Alderman DeVries asked Chief Driscoll could you come to the microphone. You had similar concerns and I am just wondering if they are based on issues that you have seen in other communities, or are your thoughts based on speculation?

Chief Driscoll replied I came here with no facts at all Alderman only that in my years of experience as I have toured New England I have a vision in my head of what a tattoo parlor looks like, how it is advertised and I can't envision that in our community.

Alderman DeVries asked so it is not based on any specific problems that other Police Departments have had, like Hampton?

Chief Driscoll replied for years I have ridden through communities here in New Hampshire that do allow it and I have been very thankful that Manchester does not allow it. I don't think it is becoming at all to a community and I certainly don't

think it would be becoming to the downtown or South Willow Street or the Second Street area when everybody has worked so hard to improve those areas.

Chairman Wihby asked Alderman Gatsas do you have any questions for the Chief?

Alderman Gatsas replied yes I do. I think that I remember five Aldermen sitting on Administration probably three or four meetings ago working this ordinance over. There was no Police Department; there was no Chamber and no Intown. I would love to think that the *Hippo Press* and the *Union Leader* didn't write about it, but I think it surfaced in the news at least four times in the *Union Leader* and four times in the *Hippo Press*. Everybody needs to understand if right now somebody wants to open up a body-piercing establishment they can put it anywhere in this City. There is no restriction. They can put it any place they want to put it. There is a lawsuit that is happening now challenging the City of Manchester about a first amendment right that tattooing is freedom of speech. I guess we could throw this out bring it in or do what ever but if that lawsuit prevails we have no ordinance and they can go anywhere. I would say on behalf of the five Aldermen and three of us being here who sat on Administration, where was everybody talking about not wanting to do this?

Chief Driscoll asked if that is a question for me I only knew it was on one agenda, and I did attend that meeting and at the time didn't think it was an issue that would impact the Police Department to the degree that I think it does now. I quite frankly thought that the Committee on Administration would reject it. The City has a long history of that and I guess I am here tonight because it is my responsibility to take a position on this and I do not agree with it.

Alderman Gatsas stated the City also has a long history of not allowing sushi parlors on Elm Street. I do not know if you are aware of that, but it is an ordinance in regards to raw fish, am I right Mr. Rusczek?

Mr. Rusczek replied the sushi bars were a matter of policy when the sushi first became a popular issue. There are no regulations and control to allow it to safely occur.

Alderman Gatsas stated it was a City ordinance that we changed.

Chairman Wihby stated we're not talking about sushi we're talking about tattoos. Is this committee receptive to tabling and getting input from the Chamber and Intown and letting them send something formally to us?

Alderman Smith stated I would like to make a motion to table. I believe that we have insufficient information. Intown has come in at the last minute, Chamber of Commerce we do not know what their status is, the Police Department definitely and the Health Department says it is going to be state regulated. So I think we need more information before we make a decision.

Chairman Wihby asked do I have a second to that?

Alderman O'Neil stated we have had this three months in front of the Committee on Administration and other than Fred Rusczyk no one else showed up and I thought we did a pretty good job of trying to work out a compromise.

Chairman Wihby interjected but they're here now.

Alderman O'Neil stated it is kind of a slap in the face of the Committee of Administration that everyone is showing up now. We put a lot of time into this to try to get something that was acceptable.

Chairman Wihby replied you might have put a lot of time in, but they are here now. They are telling you not to do it. I guess there are concerns with having it on Elm Street. We can send it back to the Committee on Administration if that's who wants it.

Chairman Wihby stated we have a motion to table and nobody seconded. I will take another motion.

Alderman DeVries replied I will move the question.

Chairman Wihby asked move the question to what?

Alderman DeVries replied to pass the ordinance.

Alderman Smith seconded that the zoning ordinance amendment ought to pass.

Deputy Clerk Normand stated that you need to set a public hearing for that.

Chairman Wihby asked for which one?

Deputy Clerk Normand replied for the amending of the zoning ordinance for the tattoos. The next available date is June 18th.

Chairman Wihby asked why wouldn't it have said here to set up a public hearing? You are saying that it did not pass and it is not going to the full board for passing it is going to the full board for public hearing?

Deputy City Solicitor Arnold replied that is correct. This is an amendment to the zoning ordinance, which pursuant to statute requires a public hearing.

Chairman Wihby asked what are we doing? So we shouldn't have been discussing it, we should have just set the public hearing first and discussed it after? Why didn't it say that on here?

Deputy City Solicitor Arnold replied this was sent to Bills on Second Reading for review. What order the committee takes up a task is up to the committee, but it does have to go to public hearing.

Chairman Wihby stated it is no different than items four and five and all we are asking for is that they take it up at a public hearing. So we had this whole discussion that is going to a public hearing and it will come back to this committee again? Why isn't that the same that you have written for items four and five then?

Deputy City Clerk Johnson replied I would apologize from the Clerk's perspective because it was my error. When I reviewed the agenda I missed that and they got put together and I didn't realize it was a zoning ordinance, or it would have been separated out, so it is my fault.

Chairman Wihby asked so we have a motion now that we just accepted to pass the thing and we don't even know?

Deputy City Clerk Johnson replied the proper motion for the committee would be to refer it to a public hearing because it is a zoning ordinance and it has to follow that process by state law.

Alderman DeVries withdrew her motion.

Chairman Wihby stated the first motion is no good, and the new motion is to send it to a public hearing on June 18th at 7:00 P.M.

Alderman Sysyn moved to refer the ordinances relating to tattoos to public hearing on June 18th in the Aldermanic Chambers of City Hall. Alderman Forest duly seconded the motion. Chairman Wihby called for a vote. There being none opposed the motion carried.

Chairman Wihby addressed the Special Merit Pay Increase Ordinance:

“Amending Section 33.049 Special Merit Pay Increases of the Code of Ordinances of the City of Manchester by deleting said section in its entirety.”

On motion of Alderman Smith, duly seconded by Alderman Forest, it was voted that the Ordinance ought to pass.

Chairman Wihby addressed item 4 and 5 of the agenda suggesting they be sent to a public hearing on June 18th at 7:00 PM and noting that it is the same evening we will take up the other two items.

Petition for rezoning of Map 712/Lots 2 and 3 Hazelton and Brown Avenues submitted by Attorney Lazos on behalf of the King Family Trust.

Petition for rezoning of Map 711/Lot 2, Map 712/Lot 1A, and Lot 1 @ Pettinghill Road and Brown Avenue submitted by Attorney Lazos on behalf of the King Family Trust.

On motion of Alderman DeVries, duly seconded by Alderman Smith, it was voted to refer both petitions for rezoning to public hearing on June 18, 2002 at 7:00 PM in the Aldermanic Chambers of City Hall.

There being no further business, on motion of Alderman Forest, duly seconded by Alderman Smith, it was voted to adjourn.

A True Record. Attest

Clerk of Committee